

**General Plan 2020
Interest Group Committee Meeting Minutes
October 8, 2001**

Interest Group Committee:

Al Stehly	Farm Bureau
Alexandra Elias	American Planning Association
Bruce Tabb	Environmental Development
Dan Silver	Endangered Habitats League
Diane Coombs	Citizen Coordinate for Century 3
Eric Bowlby	Sierra Club
Gary Piro	Save Our Land Values
Greg Lambron	Helix Land Company
Jim Whalen	Alliance for Habitat Conservation
Kevin Doyle	National Wildlife Federation
Liz Higgins	San Diego Association of Realtors
Matt Adams	Building Industry Association
Mike Stepner	SD Regional Economic Development Corporation
Phil Pryde	San Diego Audubon
Terry Barker	American Society of Landscape Architects

Public at Large:

Allison Rolfe	SD Audubon Society
Charlene Ayers	
Dave Shibley	
Dutch Van Dierendonck	Ramona Planning Group
Eric Larson	Farm Bureau
Jan Van Dierendonck	Ramona
Jeanne Pagett	Fallbrook
Joan Kearney	Ramona
Juliana Bugbee	Lakeside
Karen Tucker	
Lael Montgomery	Valley Center
Lisa Haws	Viejas Enterprises
Lynne Baker	Endangered Habitats League
Mary Allison	USDRIC
Mike Thometz	MERIT
Pat Flanagan	SDNHM
Rich Cantillon	Sierra Club
Ron Pennock	ECCC
Tracy Morgan Hollingworth	SD Association of Realtors
Wallace Tucker	Land Conservancy Coalition

County Staff:

Karen Scarborough (DPLU, group facilitator)
Gary Pryor (DPLU)
Ivan Holler (DPLU)
Michelle Yip (DPLU)
Aaron Barling (DPLU)
Tom Harron (County Counsel)

Peggy Gentry (WRT Consultant)

Agenda Item II: Logistics –

- b) Board Hearing Update for September 26, 2001
 - K. Scarborough stated that the chairman basically said the Interest Group Committee should continue for the duration of the project.
- c) Steering Committee Update for October 6, 2001
 - K. Scarborough stated that the Steering Committee is progressing well and seem to be coalescing around their perspective of where things are coming together from a community level. She feels the Interest Group Committee's task is to look regionally at the vision for the backcountry and to see where we are going in the future. She believes that the two committees will meet some place at a regional vision and collect there.
- d) Field Trip
 - The field trip to Spring Valley, Jamul/Dulzura, Tecate, Potrero, Campo, Pine Valley and Alpine is still scheduled for Monday, October 29th.
 - There will be two meeting locations: Carmel Valley Rd at 8:45 am (limited to six people) and outside the DPLU Hearing Room (5201 Ruffin Rd, Ste B) at 9:00 am.
- a) Minutes for September 24, 2001
 - E. Bowlby corrected his statement on page 4: ... *he does not think that the infrastructure is there that can handle it.*
 - D. Coombs corrected the final list of communities for the upcoming field trip on page 2 by adding Spring Valley.
 - M. Adams moved to approve the minutes. J. Whalen seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Agenda Item III: Process –

- a) Status & Next Steps
 - K. Scarborough stated that there were some color modifications made to the map and that she wanted to discuss those and the previous points of concern that has been on the agenda. She feels that the map needs to be moved to a structural map view.
 - J. Whalen agreed that the group is at the point where they need to work on the map, however, feels that they are missing key items, such as information or an analysis of TDR/PDRs, receiving/sending sites, and transit nodes. G. Pryor thinks that the group is all agreeing on where they are and responded that the group needs to ground the truth because what is said may look good until the reality check comes in. He also added that we cannot deal with TDRs until we figure out where to place the density.
 - G. Piro stated that he agreed with G. Pryor except for the catalyst missing in the next step. Thinks the group needs more tools before approving the map: facilities, transit plan, and gap analysis. G. Pryor responded that staff is waiting for direction that that is where the yellow bubbles are going to go.
 - L. Higgins stated that the group needs to look at what is on the ground and legal lots in order to do a reality check of where it is and where the lines need to go.
 - G. Lambron asked if there were fatal flaws with the infrastructure because that may be more of a constraint. G. Pryor responded that staff does know where those constraints are, however, he is not going to show it at the beginning because we are trying to show the concepts, which gives you the range of choices rather than precluding your choices. K. Scarborough stated that the group needs to affirm the concepts, then see the existing facilities at the next meeting.

- G. Pryor pointed out that the draft regional structure map is public record, however, he does not intend to mass produce the map but the public is welcome to come into DPLU to look at the map.
- D. Silver summarized the group's next steps: 1) structure map, 2) densities to be assigned, and 3) a reality based plan – when deciding where to put densities, the committee should know what the ground rules are that staff is going to use.
- A. Stehly disagreed with G. Piro stating that he wanted to remain at a regional scale, to say where the growth should go rather than getting into details.
- M. Johnson feels that there is a priority on infrastructure and would at least, like to discuss transportation. He also feels that there is not enough discussion on commercial/retail capability, which is important to discourage sprawl. G. Pryor replied that M. Johnson is correct, however, you cannot place commercial/industrial in if you do not know how much growth is going to be placed there.

Agenda Item IV: Structure Map –

a) Review of “Corrections”

- I. Holler stated that today, the group is only going to see clarifications and corrections or mapping errors. Staff will not be showing requests to examine changes from those meetings with both groups (environmental and development interests).
- A. Barling stated that staff realized that there were errors on the map and questions regarding why things are they way they are. The following were re-examined or changed on the draft regional structure map:
 - ⇒ Otay Ranch – partially built, so it will remain on the map as is
 - ⇒ Rams Hill and Jacumba Valley Ranch – request to show some open space in the SPA, green was added
 - ⇒ Ranchita – mapping error, green was added using the concepts
 - ⇒ Ocotillo Wells – mapping error, green was added using the concepts
 - ⇒ Ramona – there were areas that staff had assumed would come out green and did not
 - ⇒ Dulzura and Julian – larger parcels that went green
- D. Silver mentioned that Otay Lakes is a major amendment area in MSCP and has an agreement with the wildlife agencies.

b) Discussion of Previous Points of Concern

1) MSCP Pre-Agreement Areas

- G. Pryor stated that MSCP was pre-agreed to so staff is not going to make any changes to it.
- M. Thometz stated that East County currently does not have an MSCP plan and inquired about what the projection is going to be in East County.

2) Specific Plan Areas

- I. Holler stated that there are over 100 “paper” SPAs and that staff is going to go back and look at criteria. If the group chooses to discuss this at the next iteration, staff can bring it then.
- A. Stehly asked what an SPA was. G. Pryor replied that most are basically development that was not satisfied with the density, which all vary depending on where they are at. J. Whalen stated that they are sort of a tailored zoning instrument which allows for flexibility.
- A. Stehly asked what the discussion is over SPAs. G. Pryor responded that there are SPAs who got the tailored zoning and protected density but did not do anything with it. D. Silver added that SPAs were supposed to be local government tools and in essence, change each property, however, in practice, it became much different.

3) Concept D

- P. Pryde re-stated that the “village core” on the concept is an inadvertent mistake, which was meant to be called “country town.”
- **Motion:** P. Pryde moved to modify the title of the top box in the original concepts from “village core” to “village”.
- **Vote:** Motion passed unanimously. P. Pryde stated that he was “happy as a clown.”

4) Semi-Rural Category

- D. Silver stated that the fundamental point to him is that anything yellow should correspond to the concepts. It should be a portrayal of what is already committed of rural estate, which is roughly 1 du/ac to 1 du/10 ac. He thinks B. Tabb’s point of the islands of green in the yellow should be “yellowized.” There might be a need to “intensify” the yellow but thinks that needs a “burden of proof”, to ensure that it did not just go into the “suburban” areas and to be assured that it went into the maximum extent of infill potential, while reaching the target. He proposed keeping yellow 1 du/ac to 1 du/10 ac but allow necessary expansion of the core, so if there is a need to intensify the yellow area, turn it brown or red in order to accommodate additional population, so it is a potential for smart intensification.
- B. Tabb agrees with D. Silver that the yellow should be based off criteria and definition and wanted to ensure that the criteria is agreed upon and thought of as the same. As to the turning the yellow to red, he feels it is a good idea from a market perspective but may not be realistic, however, is open at looking into that. Also feels that community groups are best at looking at areas but is important for staff to look at facilities.
- K. Doyle feels that this will really help the group get to transit nodes and thinks it makes sense to use this type of approach.
- J. Whalen asked if it was staff’s intention to make sure the map is correct by parcel. G. Pryor replied not on this map, however, when it gets to community specific, we will look for identifiable demarcation.
- P. Pryde stated that he would be supportive if it is to be applied only west of the line.
- E. Bowlby thinks that what D. Silver is putting forward, puts forth those inefficient land use patterns that LeAnn had said was on the west side that had a lot of parcelization. Thinks what needs to happen is the reduction of yellow and an increase in green.
- K. Scarborough asked for a clarification in that if you were to upzone some yellow to red, then there needs to be a concurrent movement of the yellow. D. Silver stated that it is not a discretion of whether to move the yellow to the green nor green to the yellow but is rather, an issue of map accuracy.
- M. Adams asked about the process to make that call of going from semi-rural to village. D. Silver responded with the burden of proof, which is the next step that staff needs to do. In essence, if we do not reach 660,000, staff needs to use that target number and rather than intensifying the yellow, convert it to red or brown if you need to. How much or how little is not known yet, so the bottom line is that no more green turns to yellow.
- M. Adams stated that this proposal is based on a lot of assumptions and appears to need a little more fleshing out. D. Silver replied that we cannot really go from yellow to brown or red without knowing the infrastructure.
- A. Stehly stated that the group never really talked about how the Steering Committee gutted the concepts and wanted to make it clear that the Interest Group Committee still supports clustering. I. Holler replied that the reason the Steering Committee took out clustering was because it was already mentioned in the goals and policies and that staff knows there are some conflicting issues in

that. G. Pryor added that the main rub is that language in those goals need to be sorted out.

- J. Whalen wanted to remind people of intensifying the yellow, not only to target how many units but also value, since the goal is to also provide a value mechanism.
- D. Silver mentioned that the village designation, west of the CWA, is 2 du/ac to 7.3 du/ac and 2 du/ac are still large lots.
- M. Stepner suggested that D. Silver place his proposal into a motion to prevent the group from re-visiting the matter. D. Silver did not want to get into word-smithing and proposed a “conceptual motion.”
- **Motion:** Following an accurate structure map and heirarchy of assigning population toward the west and urbanized areas, to meet 2020 objectives, appropriate areas of semi-rural can be changed to village west of the CWA as necessary. M. Stepner seconded the motion.
- **Public comments:**
 - ⇒ Unknown: Feels that it is a dangerous step because it is a step towards undermining the confidence in the whole process in terms of the residences in the communities. One thing they fear, above all else, is that the urban areas are going to expand. They like to have certainty that they have defined these areas and that they are not going to be changed as necessary. It is like putting a trojan horse in your concept. P. Pryde responded that this comment was a very valid concern and that both committees need to focus on appropriate areas, which need to be justified.
 - ⇒ D. Van Dierendonck had some reservations on the motion but did not think the group would have a big problem with this in the general sense.
 - ⇒ D. Shibley agreed with G. Pryor that this would be more appropriate in a TDR program and that this would open doors to create new villages.
- E. Bowlby stated that without looking at what the term “appropriate” means and looking at the criteria, he cannot support the motion and thinks the group should wait on it.
- **Vote:**
 - ⇒ Favored: 15
 - ⇒ Opposed: 1 (E. Bowlby)
 - ⇒ Abstained: 0

5) 10 Acre Designation – Category Identification

- K. Scarborough stated that there is a dilemma of not knowing where the 10 acre designation should go. Should it go in semi-rural or rural and how does it work with the ag needs and desires.
- A. Stehly stated that he always agreed that 10 acres is a good size for a farm because that is where the average is right now and some of the best farm land is east or outside of the water district.
- D. Silver stated that he did not think that it is appropriately placed anywhere and the semi-rural is where you get the 10 acre designation. If there is a 10 acre need, mapped in semi-rural, he thinks it should be incorporated into semi-rural but what he objects to is, putting a 10 acre category in rural.
- K. Scarborough chose to table this agenda item in order to come back to the regional categories.

6) Densities – Ranges within Categories

- K. Scarborough chose to table this agenda item in order to come back to the regional categories.

7) Concepts

- There was a general consensus of satisfaction of the concepts.

- J. Whalen stated that he was not “happy” with the concepts but he is willing to work with them, subject to continuous revision. He added that he has a personal interest in knowing the difference between these and the existing categories and how they meld. K. Scarborough replied that that is ultimately, where we are headed.
- D. Silver suggested that the group leave the concepts the way they are and make changes to the regional categories because that is where the reality check is. There was general consensus upon this suggestion.

8) Transit

- K. Scarborough stated that this item is to let G. Piro know that it is still on the table.

9) TDR/PDR Program Tool

- D. Coombs thinks that there should be some preliminary discussion on this. She would like another expert to discuss other tools for the toolbox and suggested Terry Watt.
- G. Piro stated that he wanted to see more expansion on these tools and asked about Rick Pruetz. I. Holler replied that R. Pruetz has sent a letter regarding steps of how to go into a TDR program.
- B. Tabb stated that D. Van Dierendonck had a good point and that part of the analysis should include commercial and industrial.
- M. Stepner feels that the group needs an agenda and needs to discuss the tools before hearing someone speak about them. K. Scarborough replied that the “tools” sub-committee can set up an agenda.
- A. Elias suggested having a director come in, someone that is actually implementing the program, to come in and speak as well.
- **Motion:** D. Coombs moved to have the “tools” sub-committee come up with an itinerary of information of what is needed and come back to the group with the list. G. Piro seconded the motion.
- T. Morgan Hollingworth suggested bringing in some resources that the SD Association of Realtors have.
- **Vote:**
 - ⇒ Favored: 15
 - ⇒ Opposed: 0
 - ⇒ Abstained: 1 (E. Bowlby)
- P. Pryde stated that it has been mentioned more than once that the communities know the communities and would be more than happy if the Steering Committee decides where the receiving areas are.
- D. Shibley stated that SOLV indicated that they were working on a baseline map, which forms a baseline for a TDR program. It should be voluntary and you should know how many units you can transfer. Also added that the best time to do a TDR program is during a general plan update. I. Holler replied that there may have been a misunderstanding. Staff is currently working on public lands and not receiving areas. A TDR program is a separate program from a general plan, you clearly need to run an environmental impact on transferring developments.

Agenda Item V: Public Comments –

- Written/e-mailed submission by Ron Sullivan: “...a land owners perspective and concerns of some of the language and down zoning. The recommendation by Dan Silver (Habitats Conservation League??) is very disturbing and undermines the rights of freedom in our country "Incorporate mention of the removal of existing Parcels." Also, Carolyn Chase - "Remove

concept of land value." In or out of context these statements and others in this 2020 planning movement is quite disturbing.

Further:

The twin towers were the ultimate symbol of smart growth. Concentration of people and infrastructure in small dense areas is strategically and tactically a huge mistake relative to biological, chemical or nuclear threats from terrorist groups or hostile countries. The caution I presented as a volunteer to the Supervisors' Smart Growth housing subcommittee about this situation was ignored a couple years ago. Unfortunately I have been proven correct then and we should not continue to think the same way after September 11, 2001.

Survival of our human population may depend on more independence of power, transportation, water and food supplies. We need more human travel corridors, i.e. roads and freeways, and less, expensive, inconvenient and time consuming mass transit. (I have used many of the mass transit systems in Europe, which is a much different situation than we have.) Wildlife corridors should come after human transportation corridors.

The population growth required to justify mass transit types of transport systems will forever change San Diego's quality of life and lifestyle. The economic development planning, population immigration and birth rates are a cornerstone of good planning. These elements do not seem to be anywhere on the agenda, yet, they are what drive population growth. Those elements should be part of the plan.

After the September 11 attack, I would hope we would not continue pushing for higher density cities and towns as "smart" growth. Considering only 5% of our country is developed as urban area's we are not in any real or perceived danger by allowing some growth (10 acre lots) to be in more survivable rural areas."

- D. Van Dierendonck congratulated the entire committee on their professionalism.
- M. Thometz asked if staff was going to apply what was wrong with the map next time. I. Holler responded with just a buff overlay, it will not be a re-draft of the map.
- M. Thometz thinks there are some areas that should be changed to green. He also expressed concern when discussing balancing work and where people live because people live in the backcountry and work in the city.
- R. Pennock urged the group to look at the availability of infrastructure and not just existing. Agrees that 10 acres may make a nice farm but it is a terrible homesite and so people are not looking for homes in those areas.
- L. Montgomery thinks that a lot of communities would be appalled by two acres and thinks we need to ask people what is rural.